United Nations A/56/257/Add.1

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 November 2001
English
Original: Arabic/English/Russian

Fifty-sixth session
Agenda item 74 (s)
General and complete disarmament: transparency in armaments

United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

Report of the Secretary-General

Addendum

Contents

		Page
II.	Information received from Governments	2
	A. Composite table of replies of Governments	2
	B. Replies received from Governments	2
III.	Index of background information provided by Governments for the calendar year 2000	6
IV.	Information received from Governments on military holdings and procurement through national production	6
Annex		
	Views received from Governments in accordance with paragraph 5 (a) of General Assembly resolution 55/33 U	8

01-66351 (E) 301101

II. Information received from Governments[1]

A. Composite table of replies of Governments[2]

State	Data on exports	Data on imports	Explanation submitted in note verbale	Background information
Austria	yes	nil		yes
Niger	nil	nil		no
Russian Federation	yes	nil		no
Saint Kitts and Nevis	nil	nil		no
Tonga	nil	nil		no
Tuvalu	nil	nil		no
Ukraine	yes	nil		no

B. Replies received from Governments

Austria

Reporting country: Austria

Original language: English
Background information provided: yes

Calendar year: 2000
Date of submission: 20 September 2001

Exports

A	B	C	D	E	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	Final importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks	Brazil	17			Armoured tank destroyer SK 105	
	Botswana	20			Armoured tank destroyer SK 105	
II. Armoured combat vehicles	Botswana	2			AK7FA-ACPV	

[1] The documents have been reproduced as received. The designations employed do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory or area, or of its authorities.

[2] With the submissions listed in the table, the number of replies received from Governments stands at 112.

Russian Federation

Reporting country: Russian Federation

Original language: Russian
Background information provided: no

Calendar year: 2000
Date of submission: 15 November 2001[3]

Exports

A	B	C	D	E	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	**Final importer State(s)**	**Number of items**	**State of origin (if not exporter)**	**Intermediate location (if any)**	**Description of item**	**Comments on the transfer**
I. Battle tanks	Yemen	31				
II. Armoured combat vehicles	United Arab Emirates	30				
	Yemen	1				
	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	10				
III. Large calibre artillery systems	Ethiopia	307				
IV. Combat aircraft	Bangladesh	4				
	Belarus	4				
	India	1				
	Ethiopia	4				
	Kazakhstan	14				
	China	18				
V. Attack helicopters	Angola	2				
	Nigeria	6				
VI. Warships	India	1				
	China	1				
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	Algeria	16				
	India	200				
	Viet Nam	8				
	China	119				

[3] The submission has been delayed as a result of the reorganization of the system of military and technical cooperation in the Russian Federation.

Ukraine

Reporting country: Ukraine

Original language: Russian
Background information provided: no

Calendar year: 2000
Date of submission: 19 November 2001

Exports

A	B	C	D	E	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	**Final importer State(s)**	**Number of items**	**State of origin (if not exporter)**	**Intermediate location (if any)**	**Description of item**	**Comments on the transfer**
I. Battle tanks	Algeria	13			T-72M1, T-72M1K	
II. Armoured combat vehicles	United States of America	9			BMP-2	
	Jordan	26			BTR-94	
	China	5			BTR-70	
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	30			BTR-60	
		6			MT-LB	
III. Large calibre artillery systems	United States of America	3			2S3	
	China	3			2S9	
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	6			2S1	
IV. Combat aircraft	Russian Federation	6			TU-160	
		1			TU-95MS	
	India	3			MIG-21UM	
	Algeria	5			MIG-29	
	Estonia	21			L-39, L-39S	Demilitarized
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1			L-39S	Demilitarized
	United States of America	27			L-39, L-39S	Demilitarized
	Sri Lanka	6			MIG-27M	
		1			MIG-23UB	

Ukraine (Exports cont'd)

A	B	C	D	E	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	**Final importer State(s)**	**Number of items**	**State of origin (if not exporter)**	**Intermediate location (if any)**	**Description of item**	**Comments on the transfer**
V. Attack helicopters	Sri Lanka	2			Mi-24V-1	
		3			Mi-24P	
	Israel	1			Mi-8MT	
	Guinea	3			Mi-24V	
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2			Mi-24V	
		2			Mi-24K	
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	Algeria	42			R-27T,R	
	India	40			R-27RE, TE	
	Russian Federation	581			X-55MS	
	China	124			R-27RE, TE, R-73	
	Slovakia	3			R-77	

III. Index of background information provided by Governments for the calendar year 2000

State	*Title*	*Language*
Austria	National holdings. Background information related to Austrian holdings. Procurement through national production (Nil report: no domestic production)	English

IV. Information received from Governments on military holdings and procurement through national production

Austria

Military holdings

A	B	C	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	**Number of items**	**State of origin**	**Description of item**	**Comments**
I. Battle tanks	2	former USSR	T 72 M1T	
	2	former USSR	T 55 AM2	
	163	United States of America	MBT M 60 A3Ö	
	114	Germany	MBT Leopard	
II. Armoured combat vehicles	155	Domestic	APC A1	
	105	Domestic	APC A1/20mm	
	276	Domestic	HACV K/105mm	
	68	Domestic	APC/UN	
	88	Federal Republic Germany	TD JAGUAR 1	
	8	Federal Republic Germany	TD JAGUAR 2	
	1	former USSR	BMP-2	
	2	former USSR	BMP-1	
	2	former USSR	BTR-70	
	2	former USSR	PTS-M/PKP	
III. Large calibre artillery systems	104	United States of America	M 101	
	189	United States of America	M 109	
	24	United States of America	M 2/immobile	

A	B	C	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	**Number of items**	**State of origin**	**Description of item**	**Comments**
	4	United States of America	M 30	
	63	United States of America	M 2	
	193	Domestic	M 86	
	48	Domestic	M 60	
IV. Combat aircraft	23	Sweden	S-35Ö	
	29	Sweden	S-105Ö	
V. Attack helicopters	NIL			
VI. Warships	NIL			
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	NIL			

Background information related to Austrian holdings

Ad. II: Armoured combat vehicles

6 M60 A3Ö have been taken out of service (used as exhibit)
2 ATMG JAGUAR 1 has been taken out of service (spare part donor)
2 ATMG JAGUAR 2 have been taken out of service (spare part donor)
8 HAVCV K/105 mm have been taken out of service (6 used as exhibit, 2 spare part donor)

Ad. III. Large calibre artillery systems

1 M101 has been taken out of service (used as exhibit)
1 M30 has been taken out of service (scrapped)
2 M2 have been taken out of service (used as exhibit)
24 M2/immobile (out of service)

Ad. IV. Combat aircraft

1 SAAB DRAKEN has been taken out of service (spare part donor)

Annex

Views received from Governments in accordance with paragraph 5 (a) of General Assembly resolution 55/33 U

Reply of the League of Arab States to General Assembly resolution 55/33 U, "Transparency in armaments"

The States members of the League of Arab States wish to reaffirm their position, dated 2 October 2000, regarding transparency in armaments, particularly in respect of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, as set forth in the report of the Secretary-General (A/55/299/Add.2), as follows:

The members of the League of Arab States have for some years past been expressing their views with regard to the entire matter of transparency in armaments, embracing as it does the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. These views are clear and well established and are based on a general orientation with respect to international disarmament issues and a particular, regional, one that is determined by the specific character of the situation in the Middle East. The points set forth hereunder convey the Arab position in this regard.

The members of the League of Arab States advocate transparency in armaments as a means of enhancing international peace and security and believe that, in order to be successful, any transparency mechanism must be guided by certain basic principles: it must be balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory, and it must enhance the national, regional and international security of all States in conformity with international law.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms represents a long-overdue first attempt by the international community to address the transparency issue at a global level. Despite the fact that the potential value of the Register as a global confidence-building measure and early-warning mechanism cannot be questioned, it has encountered a number of problems. Most noticeably, approximately one half of the States Members of the United Nations have consistently refrained from submitting data to the Register.

In this context, the members of the League of Arab States are of the view that the scope of the Register must be expanded, particularly as the experience of past years has shown that the Register, which is limited to seven categories of conventional arms, will not attract universal participation. Numerous States, including the members of the League, do not consider that the Register, given its present limited scope, adequately meets their security needs. The future success of the Register is therefore contingent upon the willingness of the members of the international community to engage in greater transparency and to build greater confidence. In our view, and as envisaged in the Register's founding resolution (General Assembly resolution 46/36 L), an expanded register including data on advanced conventional weapons, on weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and on high technology with military applications would represent a more balanced, more comprehensive and less discriminatory instrument attracting a larger number of regular participants.

The Middle East region represents a special case in this context, and one where the qualitative imbalance in armaments is striking and where transparency and confidence can only come about if approached in a balanced and comprehensive way. Applying transparency in the Middle East region to seven categories of conventional weapons while ignoring more advanced, more sophisticated or more lethal armaments, such as weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, is an approach that is neither balanced nor comprehensive. It will not yield the desired results, especially since the Register does not take into consideration the existing situation in the Middle East, where Israel continues its occupation of Arab territories, maintains its possession of the most lethal weapons of mass destruction and is still the only State in the region that is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as it persists in defying repeated calls by the international community to accede to the Treaty and to place all of its nuclear facilities under the full-scope safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It was this that prompted the States parties to the Treaty meeting at the 2000 Review Conference to stress that it was essential for Israel to take these steps.

The members of the League of Arab States regret that the Group of Governmental Experts convened in 2000 to consider the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development failed, as had previous meetings of experts, to expand the scope of the Register to include military holdings and procurement from national production and that it also failed to incorporate weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons. This is incompatible with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, by which the Register was established.

This failure indicates the deadlock that has afflicted the operation of the Register and its consequent inadequacy in its present form to function as an effective means of building confidence or as an early-warning mechanism.

In the light of the above, the members of the League of Arab States are of the view that their aforesaid concerns must be addressed effectively and in such a manner as to ensure universal participation in the Register and hence its fulfilment of the role assigned to it as a means of building confidence and an early-warning mechanism that can be relied upon.